2816

0 2 2003		U.S. Paten	t and Trademark Offic	e; U.S. DE	PTO/SB/21 04/30/2003. OMB 06 PARTMENT OF COM	51-0031 MERCE	
~ ~ ~		Application Number	of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.  10/075,531				
TRANSMITTAL		Filing Date	02-13-2002				
FORM		First Named Inventor	David Nguyen, et al.				
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Art Unit	2816				
, ·		Examiner Name	Nguyen, Minh T.				
		Attorney Docket Number					
Total Number of Pages in This Submission			1726.7221200				
	El	NCLOSURES (Check all that	** **	,			
Fee Transmittal Form Fee Attached Amendment/Reply After Final Affidavits/decla Extension of Time Rec Express Abandonmen Information Disclosure Certified Copy of Prior Document(s) Response to Missing F Incomplete Application Response to Munder 37 CFR	aration(s) quest  Int Request e Statement rity  Parts/ n  Missing Parts	Drawing(s)  Licensing-related Papers  Petition  Petition to Convert to a  Provisional Application  Power of Attorney, Revocation  Change of Correspondence Addre  Terminal Disclaimer  Request for Refund  CD, Number of CD(s)	to C App of A App (Ap (Ap  Pro  Sta  Ide  Return Rec	Group Deal Comrespeals are peal Compeal Notice Peal Notice Prietary Intus Letter Per Enclose Prify beloveigt Posto	ure(s) (please v): ard ion Requirement	p	
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT							
Firm or Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730							
Signature	00 V.	Juzol					
Date 08/28/2003							
	CERTI	FICATE OF TRANSMISSION	/MAILING				
		acsimile transmitted to the USPTO or addressed to: Commissioner for Pat					
Typed or printed name	Ross D. Snyde	er, Reg. No. 37,730					
Signature		-D. Angle		Date	08/28/2003		

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Application No: 10/075,531

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

0 2 200 pplicant(s): -David Nguyen, et al.

## METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR ACCOMMODATING DELAY VARIATIONS AMONG MULTIPLE SIGNALS

App. No.:

10/075,531

Filed: 02-13-2002

Examiner:

Nguyen, Minh T.

Group Art Unit:

2816

Atty. Dkt. No. 1726.7221200

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail,

Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730 Typed or Printed Name

Signature

Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ELECTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

## <u>REMARKS</u>

The Office has identified the claims of this application as being directed to alleged patentably distinct Species I,  $\Pi$  , and  $\Pi$ I.

Applicants elect Species I (upon which Claims 1-43 and 50-52 are readable). The election requirement is respectfully traversed in order to preserve the issue for subsequent petition since the examination of all of the claims 1-52 does not create an undue burden on the Office and the subject matter among the species is not independent and distinct as required by statute.

MPEP § 808.01 equates independent inventions as those that are "not connected in design, operation, or effect under the disclosure of the particular application under consideration." Applicants note that the pending claims are connected in effect in that they all provide an effect of accommodating transition-induced delay or accommodating delay variation among multiple signals. For example, while the Examiner attempts to distinguish alleged Species I from alleged Species II, he characterizes Species I as pertaining to Fig. 9 and Species II as pertaining to Fig. 10. Yet, Applicants note that paragraphs 21 and 22 of the disclosure reveal connection in design, operation, and/or effect of Fig. 9 and Fig. 10, respectively stating that Figs. 9 and 10 are "flow diagram[s] illustrating a method for accommodating transition-induced delay...."

As another example, while the Examiner attempts to distinguish alleged Species III as pertaining to a method comprising "a step of comparison of multiple signals using nominal clock signal, early clock signal and late clock signal, and an apparatus for performing such a step," Applicants note that Fig. 13, which includes a clock generation circuit that generates a nominal clock signal of nominal timing, as well as an early clock signal and a late clock signal, is described in paragraph 75 of the disclosure as being "a block diagram illustrating an apparatus for accommodating transition-induced delay...." Thus, Applicants submit that there is sufficient evidence of connection in design, operation, or effect under the disclosure of the particular application under consideration to obviate the Examiner's election requirement.

The Applicants further disagree with the characterizations relied on by the Office to identify the alleged Species and to support their alleged distinctiveness. Applicants submit that the descriptions of the alleged Species provided by the Examiner constitute an oversimplification and mischaracterization of the attributes of the claimed invention. For example, the Examiner cites particular Figures in the descriptions of the alleged Species. However, Figures must be assessed in the context of the disclosure provided in the specification. Notwithstanding that a claim may read on an embodiment, Applicants do not concede that any particular feature of an embodiment is an element of such a claim.

The Examiner has identified alleged Species II as being "a method comprises a step of causing a first timing signal to occur at a first time wherein the first time is sampled based on a first timing, Fig. 10 and the apparatus for performing such a step." Applicants believe the Examiner may have intended for that description to be stated as follows: "a method comprises a step of causing a first timing signal to occur at a first time wherein the first line is sampled based on the first timing signal, Fig. 10 and the apparatus for performing such a step." Clarification is respectfully requested.

With respect to alleged Species III, the Examiner does not cite a Figure as was done in the cases of alleged Species I and II. Applicants believe the Examiner may have intended to cite Fig. 14. Clarification is respectfully requested.

The Examiner states that claims 1, 8, 16, 32, and 36 appear generic and requests Applicants to confirm or correct that identification. Moreover, the Examiner states that the claims appear to contain "112 first paragraph problems (no teaching is seen in the specification)." Applicants respectfully disagree. However, Applicants cannot further respond to the Examiner's assertions of "112 first paragraph problems" absent a reasonably detailed explanation of what the Examiner considers to be such problems. Applicants note that MPEP § 806.04(d) states that it is not possible to define a generic claim with that precision existing in the case of a geometrical term and further states that in an application presenting three species illustrated in three Figures, a generic claim should read on each of those views. However, given Applicants' objections set forth above concerning the descriptions of the alleged Species, Applicants cannot definitively characterize particular claims as either generic or nongeneric until the election requirement is clarified and its deficiencies corrected. Nonetheless, Applicants submit that, subject to the uncertainties described above, if claims 1, 8, 16, 32, and 36 are properly deemed to be generic, claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 33, 43, and 50 would also be generic, which would result in claims 1, 4, 8-10, 16, 17, 32, 33, 36, 43, and 50 being identified as generic.

In summary, Applicants have elected claims 1-43 and 50-52 readable on Species I for further prosecution and have identified claims 1, 4, 8-10, 16, 17, 32, 33, 36, 43, and 50 as being generic. Reconsideration and further prosecution on the merits of the withdrawn claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

128/2003

Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.

115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 107

Austin, Texas 78746

(512) 347-9223 (phone)

(512) 347-9224 (fax)